

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-3, 7, 9-13, 17, and 18 are now in the application. Claims 1-3, 7, 9-13, 17, and 18 are subject to examination. Claims 1, 2, 7, 9, and 11-13 have been amended. Claims 4, 5, 14, and 15 have been canceled to facilitate prosecution of the instant application.

Under the heading "Claims Objection" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 7 and 9 because they depend from cancelled claim 6. The indication of the informality is appreciated and claims 7 and 9 have been amended to depend from claim 1.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-3, 7, 9-13, 17, and 18 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,355,362 to Gorshe et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,608,720 to Biegel et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 1, 2, and 11-13 have been amended to better define the invention.

Claims 2, 12, and 13 have been amended to be consistent with the changes to claims 1 and 11 and support for the changes is inherent in the claims as previously presented. Support for the changes to claims 1 and 11 can be found by referring to the specification at page 12, line 27 through page 13, line 19, at

page 14, line 21 through page 15, line 1 (see lines 21 and 29 of page 14 in particular), and at page 16, lines 26-28.

The subscriber data that is referred to in Gorshe et al. is the payload originating from subscribers, i.e. the data traffic (voice data, fax transmission, internet access) caused by using the services. Column 6, lines 18-21 of Gorshe et al. simply refer to downloading software for the common module and provides no teaching related to downloading data including line data, centrex group data, and multi line hunt group data. Column 3, lines 35-40 of Gorshe et al. simply refer to common channel signaling.

In contrast to the teaching in Gorshe et al., claims 1 and 11 specify: downloading data including line data, centrex group data, and multi line hunt group data from the host to the remote and storing the line data, centrex group data, and multi line hunt group data in a database local to the remote.

Applicants believe it is clear that the prior art does not teach or suggest the features of claims 1 and 11 copied above.

Claims 1 and 11 now specify: in response to the notification that administrative changes have been made to the Subscriber Data, downloading data including line data, centrex group data, and multi line hunt group data from the host to the remote and storing the line data, centrex group data, and multi line hunt group data in a database local to the remote.

Gorshe et al. in combination with Biegel et al. do not teach or suggest downloading the specified data in response to a notification that administrative changes have been made to the Subscriber Data. Gorshe et al. provide merely a vague teaching relating to a stand-alone capability. Lines 28-32 of column 8 of Gorshe et al. merely state that the remote digital terminal may optionally be provided to perform stand-alone switching. Column 38, line 14 through column 39, line 32 of Biegel et al. merely teach providing a notification when a database is updated; there is no teaching or suggestion that such a notification would trigger downloading the data specified in claims 1 and 11.

Claims 1 and 11 also now specify: when a loss of communication between the remote and the host is detected, performing call services with the remote in the stand alone mode, wherein the remote refers to the line data, the centrex group data, and the multi line hunt group data stored in the database local to the remote.

The prior art does not teach or suggest that a remote, for example, the optional remote switch unit 27 of Gorshe et al., which is disclosed at column 8, lines 21-25, performs call services in a stand alone mode and refers to line data, centrex group data, and multi line hunt group data that has been stored in the database local to the remote after being downloaded from the host.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 6 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 4, 5, 14, and 15 have been rejected as being

obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,355,362 to Gorshe et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,608,720 to Biegel et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,850,434 to Ardon under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Even if it were obvious to combine the teachings and even if Ardon does teach the features as the Examiner has alleged, the claimed invention would not have been obtained for the reasons specified above in regard to claims 1 and 11.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1 or 11. Claims 1 and 11 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 1 or 11.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3, 7, 9-13, 17, and 18 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Appl. No. 10/809,622
Amdt. Dated May 13, 2008
Reply to Office Action of February 22, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Werner H. Stemer/
Werner H. Stemer
(Reg. No. 34,956)

MPW:cgm

May 13, 2008

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101